

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

 APPLICATION NO.
 FILING DATE
 FIRST NAMED INVENTOR
 ATTORNEY DOCKET/NO.

 09/242,525
 02/17/99
 SATO
 S
 11301-1480

IM62/0719

GEORGE M THOMAS
THOMAS KAYDEN HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY NW
SUITE 1500
ATLANTA GA 30339-5948

SERGENT,R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1711 DATE MAILED:	07/19/00

EXAMINER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks



Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/242,525 Applicant(s)

Sato et al.

Examiner

Rabon Sergent

Group Art Unit 1711

Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·
☐ This action is FINAL .	·
Since this application is in condition for allowance except in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19	for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed 935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failur application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Exten 37 CFR 1.136(a).	e to respond within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
X Claim(s) <u>1-45</u>	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	
X Claim(s) 1-17, 19, and 21-45	
☐ Claims	
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected on	is approved disapproved. ty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). of the priority documents have been lumber) ne International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
Attachment(s) ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413 ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION OF	N THE FOLLOWING PAGES

Application/Control Number: 09/242,525

Art Unit: 1711

1. It is requested that applicants supply the months of publication of the "Other Documents" cited on the information disclosure statement of February 17, 1999.

Furthermore, applicants have failed to comply with the requirements set forth within 37 CFR 1.98 (a)(3) with respect to JP 8-53528, JP 5-505845, JP 6-500584, JP 51-73561, JP 63-68625, JP 2-99579, JP 2-102287, JP 3-140388 and, JP 3-281682. Their listing within the International Search Report is insufficient to satisfy the requirement.

- 2. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
- 3. Claims 18 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.
- 4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It appears that claim 28 should depend from claim 27.

5. Claims 1-17, 19 and 21-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants' Markush groups are improper, because the groups must be specified in the alternative. For example, the last species for the group (I) Markush group of claim 1 should be

Application/Control Number: 09/242,525

Art Unit: 1711

preceded by "or" rather than "and". The groups are improper for the specified group species and compounds.

Furthermore, it is unclear how instances of "and/or" and occurrences of "and" used with "or" in the same phrase are to be interpreted. See line 5 of claim 2 or lines 3 and 4 of claim 10 or lines 3-5 of claim 12, for example.

6. Claims 1-9, 27-36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of "can" within the claims renders them indefinite, because it is unclear if or to what extent the language denoted by "can" is a definitive or non-optional limitation.

7. Claims 1-12, 14-17, 19, 21-36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have used the language, "simultaneously or sequentially", throughout the claims; however, it is unclear what is meant by the language. It is not clear what sequence of events the language pertains to.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/242,525

Art Unit: 1711

It is unclear how compound (p) has 0.2 or more active hydrogen atoms. Clarification is required.

9. Claims 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

When compounds (t-1), (u-1), or (x-1) are selected, the claims are rendered indefinite, because step (1) of each claim is not required.

10. Claims 16, 21, 22, 27-30, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear that the products I, N, R and V of the second step include reaction schemes wherein the zircoaluminate derivatives are utilized. The confusion stems from the way in which the products are defined within the first steps.

11. Claims 2-17, 19 and 21-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants' claims are replete with terms which lack antecedent basis. Applicants' independent claims make numerous references to species defined within other independent claims. This is impermissible. Each set of claims must clearly provide adequate antecedence solely from within the set. Applicants' lack of antecedence issues are so extreme that they preclude further

Application/Control Number: 09/242,525 Page 5

Art Unit: 1711

search and consideration of the prior art. For example, independent claim 12 refers to "said compound (a-5)", "said compound (a-2)", "said compound (q)", "said compound (r)", "said compound (i)", "said compound (m)", and "the product B"; however, none of these compounds has been defined in claim 12.

12. In view of the severity of the 35 U.S.C. 112 issues and the cited prior art issues of paragraph 1, thorough search and consideration of the prior art was deemed to be unduly burdensome at the time of this examination.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent/amc

7-18-00

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER